

Comments on the Draft EIR on the PRC 421

October 16, 2007

Piers 421-1 and 421-2 are a new project and should be reviewed as such.

I support the letter from Get Oil Out to extend written comment until November 16, 200~~6~~⁷. The first thing that became obvious in reading this document was that the outcome of the EMT hearing in San Diego on October 31 would have an impact on this project. The date for written comments should be extended for two weeks so that the State Lands Commission decision and the effects on this project can be considered.

On page 4-48 it is stated that 30 ppm is the level for one hour that would cause irreversible or serious health effects. This is much higher than considered serious by medical authorities. Lower levels have caused deaths in Mexico.

PRC 421 should be addressed in the Fire Prevention and Preparedness Plan. There should be drills specifically addressed to PRC 421.

On page 4-61 there is mention that the condition and construction of the well cellar is unknown. It seems the cellar should have been inspected since this is part of the project.

Fire Protection and Emergency Response is below standards in Western Goleta, the location of this project, in the three standards for provision of fire protection service. We do not have enough firefighters, minimum on-duty personnel at engine companies, and too long on response time. The approval of any Venoco project should certainly require the payment of fees toward a new fire station.

Impact TR-2 Operation-Generated Traffic can not be adequately addressed until the EMT issue is decided. The Hollister/Bacara intersection should be properly realigned for traffic safety. This intersection will be used for trucking oil from the facility and will create a real safety problem. Many statements about this project seem to assume that either the Jovalan or a pipeline will handle the oil and the one chosen for each comment is the one most advantageous to Venoco.

4.10.6 Cumulative Impacts would be significant if trucking is required for both the EMT and PRC 421.

Visual Sensitivity should not have been classified as moderate. The entire local coastline is visually important. Such a large project is inappropriate in a recreational area.

There are a number of issues that have not been adequately reviewed. It could be hoped that the health and safety of the public would outweigh the State's financial gain from this project. However, since serious issues are both overlooked and barely considered, it appears money wins over the public. This is a long, poorly written, inadequate document.

I agree with the comments of Dr. Cox, League of Women Voters, and Fran Farina,
Barbara S. Massey